

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated May 31, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the attached amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented here are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 1- 26 stand rejected. Claims 1, 11, 15 and 18 have been amended. Support for the amendment may be found at least in FIGS. 2, 4, 7, 9 and 20, including at least pages 10, 17 and 22 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-26 based on the amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-11 and 13-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Codama (U.S. Patent No. 6,037,712, hereinafter “Codama”). The Examiner states that Codama discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIGS. 1B, 4, 5, 13A, column 4, lines 54-65 and column 9, lines 3-15.

Regarding claim 1 in particular, the Examiner alleges on pages 2 and 3 of the Detailed Action that “Codama discloses at least in figures 1b and 13a-d a display device comprising: a substrate (fig. 1b; 1) having a first region (fig. 13a; 120a) and a second region (fig. 13a; 121) surrounding the first region; a plurality of first electrodes (fig. 1; 2) disposed in d first region; an insulation member (the structure consisting of elements 3-5) arranged in the region and having a plurality of openings (not labeled) that expose a portion corresponding each of the first electrodes (2); light emitting patterns (6) disposed directly on the first electrodes (2), the light emitting patterns (6) filling up the openings (not labeled), respectively; and a single second electrode (one of 7) disposed on the light emitting patterns (6) and directly on the insulation member (3-5).”

However, on the contrary, it is respectfully submitted that Codama more accurately discloses with respect to FIG. 1B (relied upon by the Examiner) a plurality of second electrodes (7) each disposed on a respective light emitting portion (6), which in turn is disposed on a respective first electrode (2) of the plurality of first electrodes (2).

In the response to arguments section on pages 10-11 of the Detailed Action, the examiner argues that “[t]he instant claims do not limit the structure of the single second electrode to be formed as one common layer over the entire light device, as the Applicant discloses in the specification and drawings.” In response, independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 18 have been amended to recite a single second electrode formed on substantially an entire face of the substrate, thus admittedly defining over Codama.

More specifically, Codama does not disclose, teach or suggest a single second electrode formed on substantially an entire face of the substrate, the single second electrode disposed on the light emitting patterns and directly on the insulation member, as recited in amended independent claim 1 and similarly recited in amended independent claims 11, 15 and 18. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 11, 15 and 18, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-10, 12-14, 16, 17 and 19-26, define over Codama.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1-11 and 13-26 under § 102(b) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Codama in view of the knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed. The Examiner states that Codama discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, the exact dimensions of the groove and the openings, which the Examiner further states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reasons set forth below.

First, it is respectfully noted that claim 12 depends from amended independent claim 1, which is respectfully submitted as being allowable for defining over Codama as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of *the exact dimensions of the groove and the openings* allegedly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Codama.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 12 under § 103(a) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks distinguishing the prior art of record, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' Attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this Amendment or otherwise regarding the present application in order to address any questions or remaining issues concerning the same. If there are any charges due in connection with this response, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 1578
Cantor Colburn LLP
20 Church Street 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Customer No. 23413

Date: January 28, 2008